

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-25 and 42-67 will be pending in the application. Claims 1, 42, and 67 are independent claims. The applicants would like to thank the examiner for the discussions held on April 26, 2007 and May 18, 2007. After discussing the substance of the informal discussions with Han Gim, the undersigned herein submits the following remarks.

Independent claims 1, 42, and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,707,476 (“Hochstedler”). As discussed with the examiner, the system of Hochstedler displays information from medical devices, and monitors the system to detect changes in the system’s capabilities in order to determine if the display should be modified (see Col. 1 ll. 55-59). The devices output data signals over an existing interface to a processor that generates a graphical display (see col. 3 ll. 14-25). However, Hochstedler passages recited by the examiner do not disclose a system in which a device communicates a predefined canonical user interface, nor a system that allows the user to control a device using the canonical interface.

Claim 42, as amended, now recites:

A computer system comprising at least one universal console (UC) and at least one computing element, operable to allow a user to control said at least one computing element, said system comprising:

said at least one computing element having a pre-defined canonical user interface (UI) associated therewith, wherein said user interface includes at least one action-command *operable to control said computing element*;

said universal console *controlling said at least one computing element* and operable to store user preferences input to the computer system by the user;

wherein said at least one computing element communicates its associated canonical user interface to said universal console;

wherein said universal console instantiates a user interface description as a function of said canonical user interface and said

stored user preferences; and
wherein, thereafter, said universal console is operable to
control said computing element via said user interface description by
user-selection of said at least one action-command.

(emphasis added). First, as suggested by the examiner, the applicants have amended the preamble to clarify that the system comprises at least one universal controller and at least one computing element. Furthermore, the applicants have eliminated the repeated use of “UI” and “UC” in the independent claims to improve readability.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hochstedler does not teach or suggest the system recited in the above claim. As discussed with the examiner, the above claim recites that a universal controller instantiates a user interface description based upon a computing device’s canonical user interface and preferences input by the user. In addition to providing a visual display, the user interface can also provide, for example, tactile, textual or text-based interfaces. Such capabilities enable a user to uniquely tailor the universal remote control experience. The cited passages in Hochstedler do not teach or suggest the instantiation of a user interface definition from a pre-defined canonical user interface based on preferences input by the user.

Furthermore, the amended claim recites “at least one action-command *operable to control said computing element*” (emphasis added). As discussed with the examiner, the applicants have amended the claim to clarify that the universal controller can elicit action responses from the computing element (i.e., commanding a recording device to begin the recording process). In contrast, cited passages from Hochstedler do not teach or suggest the actual control of the devices whose data is being displayed on the user interface. Rather, the system of Hochstedler *controls the display of information* received from the components, rather than *controlling the actions* of the components.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0302/167451.1
Application No.: 09/775,033
Office Action Dated: November 20, 2006

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define over the teachings of Hochstedler. Dependent claims 2-25 and 43-66 are also allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency from the allowable independent claims. A Notice of Allowance for claims 1-25 and 42-67 is respectfully requested. Should the examiner have any further suggestions for expediting the prosecution of the presently pending claims, the undersigned respectfully asks the examiner contact him at 206-332-1382.

Date: May 21, 2007

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439